



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/505,397	02/01/2005	Joerg Huschke	P16309-US1	7256
27045	7590	03/06/2007	EXAMINER	
ERICSSON INC. 6300 LEGACY DRIVE M/S EVR 1-C-11 PLANO, TX 75024			NGUYEN, SIMON	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2618	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		03/06/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/505,397	HUSCHKE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	SIMON D. NGUYEN	2618	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 August 2004.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-15 and 17-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-15 and 17-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 18 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 20 August 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 18 is objected to because of the following informalities: claim 18 cannot depend on claim 18. It should be corrective as "the system of claim 17.
Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-2, 15, 17, 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Liu et al. et al. (2003/0095562).

Regarding claim 1, Liu discloses a method of reallocating time-slots (spectrum) resources for a plurality of radio networks (NIUs, figs. 1-2) in accordance with a predefined allocation scheme (GBA or DBA), wherein the channel resources has previously been allocated to each RN (in GBA scheme) (paragraph 8), comprising: generating and transmitting a request for reallocating the channel resources to a server (a base transceiver station is functioned as a server) and the server processes the

request to reallocate the channel resources to the plurality of RNs (figs.1-2, paragraphs 14-16, 24-29, 37-40).

Regarding claim 15, this claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 1, wherein a program for executing the spectrum allocation/reallocation method is inherently in the system.

Regarding claim 17, this claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 1, as apparatus.

Regarding claims 19-20, these claims are rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 1, wherein the BTS is considered as a server.

Regarding claim 2, Liu further discloses the reallocation of time-slots is dynamically (abstract) which means the reallocation time slots are performed quasi-continuously.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 3, 5-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu et al. (2003/0095562) in view of Liu et al. (2001/0049284).

Regarding claim 3, Liu-562 discloses the reallocation resource based on demand. However, Liu does not specifically disclose the reallocation resource also based on a quality of service.

Liu-284, in the same field of invention, discloses the reallocation resource based on predicted traffic demand and the quality of service (abstract, paragraphs 7, 88). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have Liu, modified by Liu-284 in order to improve the frequency resource as well as to prevent a waste of resource.

Regarding claim 5, Liu-562 discloses a portion of the frequency spectrum is reallocated (abstract, paragraphs 26-27).

Regarding claim 6, Liu-562 further discloses each network (NIU) permanently allocates GBA time slots (paragraphs 15-16, 24-27) and if the NIU does not use or extra, the assigned time slots will be reassigned or reallocated (paragraphs 26-27), which means the allocation scheme is based on spectrum credits relating to elementary units.

Regarding claim 7, Liu-562, further discloses the same time-slots are allocated for all NIUs (abstract, paragraphs 13, 40) and the request for extra time slots is provided based on demand (paragraphs 26-27).

Regarding claim 8, Liu-562 further discloses the network reassigns the spectrum among the NIUs ((paragraphs 14-15, 24-29)).

Regarding claim 9, Liu-562 further disclose the network allocating DBA time slots based on demand which means when the DBA time slots not in use, the network will

assign to other NIUs (abstract, paragraphs 24-27), or the requested time slots used only for a temporary time, after the demand is less, the time slots will be de-allocated.

6. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu et al. (2003/0095562) in view of Liu et al. (2001/0049284) and further in view of Shionozaki (6,038,214).

Regarding claim 4, the modified Liu fails to teach reallocating whole spectrum.

Shionozaki discloses reallocating whole or part of spectrum (column 2 lines 30-31, 47-48, column 8 lines 19-20). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Liu, modified by Shionozaki to allocate a portion or whole spectrum in order to improve the dynamical resource allocation.

7. Claims 10-14, 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu et al. (2003/0095562) in view of Liu et al. (2001/0049284) and further in view of O'Neil (7,099,681).

Regarding claims 10-14, 18, the modified Liu fails to teach a resource auction.

O'Neil in the same field of invention, discloses a resource bidding or auction (column 3 line 38, column 13 lines 44, 54,57, column 14 line 16, column 15 lines 1-7). It should be noted that in a bidding war for a spectrum resource, the bidding should be involved a bundle of frequencies and whose with the highest bid will get the resource, which is known to those skilled in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one

Art Unit: 2618

skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Liu, modified by O'Neil in order to satisfy a resource request in a case of the network does not has an insufficient resource for all users.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Simon Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-7894. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:00 AM to 4:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward F. Urban, can be reached on (571) 272-7899.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
600 Dulany, Alexandria, VA 22314

Or faxed to:

(571) 273-8300 (for formal communications intended for entry)

Hand-delivered response should be brought to Customer Service Window located at the Randolph Building, 401 Dulany, Alexandria, VA, 22314.

Simon Nguyen

2/20/07

SIMON NGUYEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Nguyen